

OW-2003-0075
DEN: 43.2.23

Elwood Forsht

To: cialella@castleenvironmental.net

01/16/2003 02:16 PM

cc:

Subject: Loose ends, etc.

Anthony -

If possible, I'd like to tie up all the loose ends related to your company-related information in our files. This would improve the Public Record related to your issues. The Record must logically support any proposed modifications or changes to the existing CWT guidelines. The record goes into the Water Docket and is available for inspection by any interested party. The record must provide all the information considered by the Agency and must include all of the correspondence, data, assumptions, analyses, conclusions, and alternatives considered. Our legal requirement, under the rules of Appellate procedures, is to create a written record that fully documents how we used the available information and data to arrive at the final conclusions or recommendations. In other words, any objective third-party must be able to independently reproduce our analyses and fully understand how we reached our conclusions based on the written record alone.

I've organized these requests mostly in chronological order:

1. Please provide a clean copy of your July 19, 2002 letter to Sheila Frace. I only have a fax copy, with no signature, that is difficult to read.
2. In your September 10, 2002 submission, you provided 4 pages of data related to your Capital Structure and Operating Costs. Do you want them in the Public Record or in a Confidential Record that is not available to the public? If you want to make a claim for Confidential Business Information protection, I need a letter from you with an original signature. Please include a brief rationale for your CBI claim.
3. In your September 10, 2002 submission, you also provided a 2-page description of your Operation Process. In describing the types of waste streams that you accept for treatment, it refers to "....several waste streams steel mills streams from steel mills and related facilities, transportation related cleaning, forging operations industrial water treatment sludges primarily from steel related mills, graphite based lubrication and production waste waters, Magnesium wash waters, (and) Ink waste water" It does not specifically refer to brine. However, from our conversations, I had the impression that the majority of the waste streams treated at your facility are related to oil and gas extraction brine and that this was the only source of the barium at your plant. Please provide specific information on the exact types of barium-related waste streams that you accept for treatment. Do they include oil & gas produced water {brine}, drilling fluids, drill cuttings, well treatment fluids ...; and wastes from other sources? Please provide specific information (estimates) of the proportion of the barium-related waste water treated at your facility and the pattern of treatment. Do you typically treat barium-related wastewater every operating day (24 hours/day), only one or two days per week, or only 3 or 4 hours per day, or what?

Also, to the extent possible, please provide an explanation of the sources of barium in your waste

38

2
receipts.

4. Your September 19, 20, 26, 2002; December 19, 20, 2002; and January 6, 2003 emails to me included information from US Filter (Jim Filson and Al Kabana) to you with Confidentiality Notes that the email and attachments are intended only for you and that anybody else should delete the information from their computer, etc. The September 26 and December 20, 2002 emails included attachments that describe US Filter's test procedures and results. So far, the attachments contain the critical documentation that supports your concerns. I'm hoping that US Filter has additional information, too (see item #6). However, in order to use this information, I need a release from US Filter stating that their emails and attachments or at least the attachments are not CBI and that they can go into our public record.

If US Filter does not want to release their emails to you, can you get them to summarize the bits and pieces from each email into one cohesive document that simply describes what they considered testing (starting with a brief rational on why air flotation with chemical addition is not appropriate for your wastewater, what they considered in designing your experiments/jar tests & why they selected the actual tests that were run, why they think they didn't work, Did they provide the details of the ion exchange tests, yet (mentioned in their Nov 5 and Dec 18 emails? Please send me a copy when you can. I do have a copy of the membrane test & have a few questions (see item 6). Did US Filter hold their internal conference call (mentioned in their Dec 18 email to you? If so, please ask them to include a description of the issues considered and their ideas on what to do or why they are giving up. Please include any other information or thoughts that are relevant to your barium issues.

5. Your January, 6, 2003 email to me attached an email from US Filter to you. It referred to a December 25, 2002 email that appears to contain additional data and information related to their research. Is that a typo? Who works on Christmas Day? If it's a typo, what email is he referring to? If it's correct, if possible, please send me a copy of that email. The Dec 25 email should be added to item #4 above.

6. Your December 20th email included

- a September 23, 2002 US Filter attachment that described the chem/ppt jar test methodology and results. It refers to a "5-gallon sample of pretreatment water discharge (that) was received on August, 2002." What is the exact day in August? Exactly what type of wastewater did you send to US Filter? Was it mixed raw waste from several clients or what? If so what combination of waste streams were included? Was it treated wastewater from your final outfall 001? The report refers to 8 tests using sodium sulfate and 8 tests using sodium phosphate. The results section only includes "4 data points or averages of data points." Please provide the raw data from all 16 jar tests and explain how the 16 tests were reduced to "4 averages" or whatever was done.

- and a December 20, 2002 attachment related to ion exchange testing. This appears to be based on a different sample from Castle. Again, exactly what was sent to them for testing? What was done prior to the filtration step? Were more than one test done or are the barium results after filtration and after ion exchange based on one data point each?

2

3

- Up to this point, I had the impression that you had sent multiple wastewater samples to US Filter for testing. Was this August sample and the " December " sample the only two samples tested by US Filter? If not, please provide the remainder of the data?

7. Your 9:49 am Sept 24, 2002 and January 6, 2003 emails to me refers to the work ChemProTech was doing on your waste water. Please provide the information, data, and conclusions related to their efforts.

8. Your 4:54 pm Sept 24, 2002 email to me refers to the work GEBetz was doing and attached only their jar test procedures. Please provide the information, data, and conclusions related to their efforts. If you are able to do this, please ask them to identify the specific metal scavenger, organic coagulant, and emulsion polymer referred to in their jar test procedures.

9. Your Sept 26, 2002 email to me refers to a Nalco report related to your barium problems. Please provide a copy.

Please give me a call to discuss any part or all of this request.

Many thanks,

Woody
